UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Is Easter the Answer to a Great Question? - - - - - *Evans A. Worthley*

World Religion - - *Leland P. Stewart*

Modern Man's Quest — An Ethic of Evolution - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVIII NUMBER 1

Chicago, March-April, 1952

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Leland P. Stewart: Student in Harvard Divinity School and member of the New England Philharmonic Orchestra.

Evans A. Worthley: Minister Emeritus of the First Unitarian Society, Iowa City.

Contents

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 3

ARTICLES—

Is Easter the Answer to a Great Question?—EVANS A. WORTHLEY 4

World Religion—LELAND P. STEWART 7

Modern Man's Quest—An Ethic of Evolution—LEO HIRSCH 9

CORRESPONDENCE—

A World Language—GLENN P. TURNER 14

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 15

THE FIELD—

Stalin-Tito Split—*Worldover Press* 2

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Stalin-Tito Split

Eric Geiger

The Stalin-Tito cold war, usually presented as most menacing along the borders between Yugoslavia and the Soviet satellites, often reaches its peak on the Danube River.

Since the withdrawal of the Yugoslavs from the last conference of the Danube Commission at Galatz, Romania, tension between Stalin and Tito has steadily mounted. Any reduction of the conflict, as recommended by the United Nations Assembly at Paris, must take account of the Danube and the friction on its waters.

Under all sorts of pretexts, Yugoslav river boats are delayed by Hungarian, Romanian, and Bulgarian police for several days or longer. Shipping time is thus increased, with consequent rises in freight cost. And in order to enter that part of the Danube controlled directly by the Russians, that is, the stretch between Vienna and the German city of Passau (contiguous to the Russian Zone of Austria), Yugoslav ships need special Russian permits. These are hard to obtain.

Yugoslav boats on their way to Passau sometimes spend several weeks in front of the "river gate," a pontoon bridge near Budapest, waiting for Russian permits. At one time last fall, thirty Yugoslav craft were stuck at the Austro-Hungarian border because Soviet police would not let them enter for lack of the necessary papers.

Another source of annoyance to Yugoslav shipping is Russian target practice for Soviet gunboats, of which there is generally scant if any advance warning. Russian tugs have even crashed into Yugoslav boats with considerable damage; the collisions are explained away later as "regrettable accidents."

Especially difficult for the Yugoslavs is their position towards Romania in the administration of the so-called "Iron Gate." The "Iron Gate," a dangerous narrowing of the stream where it forms the boundary between Yugoslavia and Romania, is under joint control of the two nations. Recently the Romanian government expelled

(*Continued on page* 13)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVIII MARCH-APRIL, 1952 No. 1

EDITORIAL

This journal takes particular pride in the forthcoming celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Western Unitarian Conference in Cincinnati, May 2-4. *Unity* was first started under the name of the *Pamphlet Mission* by a Committee created by the Western Unitarian Conference. For many years under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones *Unity* was the unofficial organ of the Conference. Now for some years under the present editorship this original relationship has been restored. Moreover, Jenkin Lloyd Jones was for eight years the Secretary of the Conference; and the present editor was Secretary of the Conference for ten and one-half years, and has served as President for the past twelve years. The motto of *Unity*—Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion—is also the motto on the seal of the Conference. The same spirit of liberty and integrity has dominated both *Unity* and the Conference. Both have been pioneers in the development of free religion. The grand leaders of Western Unitarianism in the latter part of the last century were often spoken of as the Unity Men. The story of the Conference is dramatic and prophetic. Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, the official historian of the Conference, has just completed an excellent history of the Conference, which will soon be issued by the Beacon Press. It is a proud story grandly told. The recent ill-considered effort to split the Conference into fragments was soundly defeated at the Evanston Conference last year. The organization and the finances of the Conference are in good condition. The individual churches are thriving as never before. Fellowship Units, some of which will one day grow into churches, are springing up all over the district. The Cincinnati celebration will be enlivened by a look backward and thrilled by a look forward. The record of the Conference in theological development and in constructive social action will sustain it as it blazes new paths into a new century. Long live the Western Unitarian Conference!

Curtis W. Reese.

Is Easter the Answer to a Great Question?

EVANS A. WORTHLEY

If a man die, shall he live again? This is the season of the year that supposedly supplies the answer to that question. It is the season of the year out of which the resurrection stories of the past evolved. All of them, including the resurrection story in the New Testament, were basically nature myths, created out of man's long wonder over the strange cycle of disappearing life and its mysterious return, bearing new hope as well as food on the bosom of Mother Earth. So I suppose we may say, as we survey the long road which the imagination of man has traveled through the millenia of time, that Easter has been an answer, and in a way a good answer, to a question which he could not help but ask. If the yearning of his heart led him far beyond the earth-bound fertility gods and goddesses to the dying and then reborn gods of the mountains and the sky, we need not be suprised that his inner necessity should make him reach so high for his answer. The ladder of his imagination was based, indeed, upon the fertile earth, which was for him a home until strange death brought awe and silence; an almost magnetic force must have lifted his wonder into the mysteries of the heavens, there to create an expectation of immortality out of both his hopes and fears. From them came also, in time, the Heavens and the Hells of more argumentative and confident theological certainties.

We are ourselves, I am sure, poor exponents today of either the immediate or the remote, the crude or the refined concepts concerning the future which have been evolved from the long past. The question of immortality is not, for an increasing number of men and women, an important problem. We are not the first among the sons of men for whom that has been true. The early Greeks and the early Hebrews apparently were not greatly interested in immortality, perhaps because they could not conceive of a desirable one, being unable to imagine man as enjoying a desirable existence when deprived of his earthly body. The religious imagination which flourished in the world in which Saul of Tarsus lived and moved, supplied for that time the necessary foundation for a satisfactory future life by promising the resurrection of the body. One hesitates to say that represented any advance over the more cautious and thoughtful Greek and Hebrew attitudes toward death and immortality. If, as the exponents of the belief expected, the world had come suddenly to an end, all might have been well. But it stubbornly refused to do so, just as the return of Jesus is not likely to fulfill the confident predictions of some of his followers today. When the world did not come to an end, the Church Fathers began to worry about what the soul would do between death and the resurrection. They finally seized upon the concept of purgatory and gave it an important place in the complex Christian theology. Hell and purgatory came to be so emphasized in Catholic doctrine and practice that the masses of men could hardly be expected to look forward to immortality with a consuming eagerness. If death came, even to unbaptized babies, without the absolutions of the Church, the people were fully aware of the dire penalties that awaited them on the other side of the grave. To aid in this, through the processes of association, death itself was represented in the most frightful manner possible. Revolting emblems of it everywhere met the eye: in the churches and the cloisters, on the bridges and highways, in rings and breviaries. Artists turned out series upon series of the gruesome "Dance of Death," showing death as a ghastly skeleton leading his victims on to an untimely end. He plays the fiddle at weddings; beats the drum in battle; shadows the scholar, the sculptor, the painter; stands leering beside the new-born baby in its cradle. The result was, as Lecky says, to make "the terrors of death for centuries the nightmare of the imagination." We ourselves are still the inheritors of a morbid interpretation of death which the Church developed in order that it might make the promise of a resurrection shine more brightly against a dark background. Death was the last enemy—a terrible enemy—and only the miracle of Easter and the resurrection offered hope of victory. Today the bright glow of the miracle is being lost from our less imaginative, less believing age; but the dark shadow of the enemy, death, for the multitude of mankind, lingers on. So much is this true that even to talk about immortality usually evokes, at best, a kind of forced attitude of concern and interest. A pious church warden expressed it very well one day when he replied to a questioner: "Of course I believe in eternal bliss, but do let us talk about something less depressing."

Well, if anyone is really interested in immortality, it would seem that he cannot be, at the same time, too morbid and apprehensive about the fact of death. It has to have its place in the picture of life as an asset rather than as a liability. This earth would soon be a most awful, an utterly intolerable planet, if there were no such process as death. The first preparation for any consideration of immortality is to be reconciled to a change in location. Death, anyway, is sure to come and may come at any time. Very well, then, what have we on hand to deal with it? Is a resurrection story surviving out of an ancient civilization the best we have to put up against that hour? Is Easter *our* answer? Or is it much less than an answer, hardly even a suggestion, as we look back upon its distant origin. We must blend not one but all seasons of the year into our fortitude and into our feeling for the meaning of life. We must welcome the rhythms of the turning earth and the pull of the Pleiades as part of the pulsations of our mysterious coming and going before we can become fully children of the immortality of our time. For us, indeed, there is a new heaven and a new earth. If we have not been reborn into our new age—atomic age—it is high time that we should be. For all things have become new, potentially new; even death and taxes. If we used a little more creative imagination regarding the former we might have some left over to apply to the significance of the latter. There is a new unity that enables a hope of immortality to be based upon the magnitudes of the universe. The law of averages implies the possibility of at least a million planets such as this one, all bathed in the delicate wave mysteries that alone seem to create and sustain life. The very essence of life itself may be in those vibrations; in some way the life of all the past and of all the future of mankind may be in the communicating subtleties that we now

know envelop the earth and reach from star to star. This is not a new materialism; it is or may be a new basis for a new spiritualism in which we may live and move and have our being.

Does this seem too rarefied and ionospheric to have any connection with these mundane semi-laboratory, muscle-minded lives of ours? Perhaps it is, but I shall call in a witness. A few years ago there was a woman in the University of Iowa by the name of Eleanor Saltzman. She was deformed in body and obviously a woman acquainted with pain, but of great courage. She was on the staff of the Child Welfare Station for ten years, during which time she published a novel, *Ever Tomorrow.* She died in a sanatorium in Benton Harbor, Michigan. William Rose Benet published one of her poems in the *Saturday Review of Literature:*

There is no death. Tho' I no longer breathe
I shall live on, I shall love on and on,
My body's dissolution born again
Deep in the earth, into tomorrow's dawn.
Why should I treasure this my bitter flesh
Beyond today? I love to live too much,
I want to sing, yielding to the wind
As must yield the tree; I want to grow
As grows the brave new corn deep green in June.
I want some dust of me to conquer space
And live anew upon a distant star.
I shall live on, I indestructible,
I shall live on thru out infinity.

I think that you can feel a delicate and tender yearning for immortality in those lines, an immortality that is not burdened by the anthropomorphic specifications of an Easter story. There were no gods for her imagination to cling to but how much else she had gathered into her quiet life, a life that seemed to move so prosaically among us! As surely as St. John of Patmos sent the Four Horsemen into the wind, riding in his imagination with the anger of God, so surely did this woman wing the Life Force that was within her on its way beyond the gates of death unworried and unafraid. There are no specifications of time and place, no house with many mansions—to such dimensions her mind was a stranger. But there is a confidence, born of the recognition that there is a continuity and a finesse in the makeup and management of what we call life, that spells immortality in some fashion, here or elsewhere. She would not, she could not bar that expectation out of her existence and it finally came forth in words.

So what? Is there anyone says so what? Yes, I think I hear them; in the market place, on the farm, in the class room. Men and women who have not yet found within themselves, who have not known or responded to the subtleties, the deeper wonders of their own mysterious being or the infinities that surround them. And yet it is in the unspeakable immensities that each life is cast, and from them, so far as we know, there is no escape. To posit annihilation or nothingness is more scepticism than is necessary. On the other hand, to demand continuity of present patterns throughout eternity forfeits that faith and perspective that belong to the complexity of life. Socrates was willing to speculate upon the possibility of enjoying converse with other wise and good men, but he was too prudent to intimate in any way that he had any assurance that he would do so after death. All of the Easters of all time have given no more light upon that question than Socrates possessed before Easters as we know them came into being. At the conclusion of the Apology he takes the position, not that there is surely immortality, but that whether death leads to annihilation or continued existence, a good man has nothing to fear from it. Today one may surely say that the infinite complexity as well as the apparent indestructibility of the Life Force leads away from any thought of annihilation; from a form of scepticism which Eleanor Saltzman, for instance, utterly rejected. Her rejection was clothed in stardust, rather than in an ancient myth. It is a different medium—whether a better one or not time alone can tell. There may well be a leap or gap, involving concepts of time and space we know not of, and for our mortal lives representing discontinuity rather than otherwise. It is a far cry from the one-celled life of the sea a hundred million years ago, to the cortex of a human brain, but that is the journey through which you and I and all men have evolved. What man will be in a million years, or whether he will be at all is a mere conjecture, as is all the far-flung future regarding details as to life on this planet. But for the universe itself, and the totality of which we are a meager part, for it, surely, there is no conceivable beginning or ending. In some mysterious manner the wave energy of the universe has become incarnate in the form of human flesh, in the delicate mechanism of some 15 billion brain cells. The wisdom of the body may be, indeed, a "learned" wisdom but its designing was not within man's ingenuity. An inconceivable Creative Power, call it what you will—the Word if you wish—has become flesh in all and each of us, and from the beginning it hath not been known what we shall be. I protest with all my being that annihilation or mere nothingness can be the only outcome and the only ending for so magnificent a mystery.

For myself I think my modification of the orthodox Easter answer began in my repudiation of the idea of the resurrection of the dead, including the account of the physical resurrection of Jesus. It became an unimportant myth to me, however important it may have been and undoubtedly was to the men and women to whom it was a living truth—a truth so real and precious that all their highest hopes here and hereafter were based upon it. In the Gospel of Matthew we read: "The graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of their graves after his resurrection and went into the holy city and appeared unto many." Did that really happen? The same imagination which created that account also created the resurrection story of Jesus. The imagination of that time could create, and the mind believe, events inconceivable in our day. For Paul it meant that "if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins, and of all men the most miserable." For others after him it meant that if the resurrection were not a fact men might well "eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." The classic repudiation of such an attitude toward life and death was expressed by Thomas Huxley in connection with his son's funeral. Writing to the author, Charles Kingsley, he said:

> As I stood beside the coffin of my little son the other day, with my mind bent on anything but disputation, the officiating minister read, as part of his duty, the words, "If the dead rise not again, let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." I cannot tell you how inexpressibly they shocked me. I could have laughed in scorn. What! because I am face to face with irreparable loss, because I have given back to the source from which it came the cause of a great happiness, still retaining through all my life the blessings which have sprung and will spring from that cause, I am to renounce my manhood, and, howling, grovel in bestiality? Why the very apes

know better, and if you shoot their young the poor brutes grieve their grief out and do not immediately seek distraction in a gorge.

This letter of Huxley's illustrates the second modification which characterizes my attitude toward the Easter answer in its orthodox setting. I mean the feeling that death is an "enemy" and is something therefore to be conquered and overthrown. "The sting of death," said Paul, "is sin." For the Hebrews and for Paul, death was not a natural event; it was always due to the evil that was inherent in the life of man. Hence the victory which was in Christ, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. It is fair to say that in general, modern man is in fact today nearer to the attitude of the Roman Plutarch than he is to the Apostle Paul. Plutarch wrote to his wife, after the death of his little daughter, words as pertinent today as they were in the first century A. D.:

Let us call to mind the years before our child was born. We are now in the same condition as then, except that the time she was with us is to be counted as an added blessing. Let us not ungratefully accuse Fortune of what was given us, because we could not have all that we desired. What we had, and while we had it, was good, though now we have it no longer.

May I sharpen this observation by reference to my own personal encounter with death nineteen years ago. Our little daughter was killed instantly in front of our house. I have reread what I had to say as I stood in the pulpit to speak of the experience on the following Sunday morning. The manuscript reveals these words:

I am only reporting the fact that so far as I can determine no single moment of bitterness or gesture of resistance has flared within me as I have stood silent under the darkened sky. I am very glad that it has been so. I have sought and I think secured a kind of composure which I prize, a peace which belongs to me because I do find myself able to participate intimately in the thought that I and all that in any way has belonged to me was and still in some way remains a flowering of that mystery which we call Nature; or if that term seems too much of the earth itself, let us pass beyond, into the depths of the Universe. . . . It is not difficult for me to contemplate that some new organization of that which to my watching eyes was life, and then suddenly was not life, may even now, in the rich and prolific variety of the Creative Energy which is more than nature, be flourishing in unimaginable beauty.

It is not strange then that I found these lines of Elinor Wylie symbolical of an immortality concept that was becoming more meaningful to me than the personalized promises of the New Testament. In either case it is the human imagination reaching out into the unknown; in the faraway centuries of the past striving to penetrate into the realm of the gods and the forces of the underworld; in our day seeking to find a new intimacy with the delicate fabric of the dawn, the wild west wind, or the light of an evening star. Miss Wylie's lines are these:

Now I have lost you, I must scatter
All of you on the air henceforth;
Not that to me it can even matter
But it's only fair to the rest of earth.

Now especially, when it is Winter
And the sun's not half so bright as he was
Who wouldn't be glad to find a splinter
That once was you, in the frozen grass?

Snowflakes, too, will be softer feathered,
Clouds, perhaps, will be whiter plumed;
Rain, whose brilliance you caught and gathered,
Purer silver have reassumed.

Farewell, sweet dust; I was never a miser;
Once, for a minute, I made you mine;
Now you are gone, I am none the wiser,
But the leaves of the willow are bright as wine.

At first glance it may seem that between Paul and the millions who have sung and still sing the resurrection story and the subtle mysticism found in the lines and lives of Elinor Wylie and Miss Saltzman there is a great gulf fixed. If we look only at the outward forms in which their thoughts are cast that may be so. But if we look more closely at the essence of their response to the mystery of life we may find something of an Easter wonder tying them together. On this day, at least, a portion of the never-dying, never-ending life of the universe, in the form of a beautiful flower, becomes the symbol by which the imagination weaves the old and the new into the hopes and aspirations of mankind. Even the cross and the crucifix seem to fade somewhat into the background as Easter lilies marshall their beauty before the eyes of worshippers. In due time even the words of the ancient ritual of the resurrection of the dead will pass into the limbo of the forgotten gods of yesterday. They will pass because the impoverished symbolism of the past will increasingly fail to quicken and excite the mind and thought of a world committed first of all to organization of its earthly life. The sure trend of science will change the mythic facts of yesterday into the folklore of tomorrow. The resurrection story may live in oratorios for ages, but as a sure and confident answer to man's oldest question it will fade away into a mere murmur on the stream of time.

"If a man die, shall he live again?" Will there ever be an indubitable answer? I doubt it. There is, certainly, no sign of its coming. As of yesterday, today, and probably forever the innumerable caravans will move to that mysterious realm, that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns. The words of the preacher will continue to be no more than an echo of man's long and laboring hopes; the symbols of his faiths and the signs of renewing life upon the earth will bring an annual Easter to mankind; for the festival is built upon the ancient formulae celebrating the death and rebirth of the vital forces of Nature. And as for the idea of immortality, it will continue to exercise an appeal as long as, in the words of Robert Ingersoll, "love kisses the lips of death"; as long as man's imagination leaps in wonder beyond the light-year magnitudes of a thousand billion stars.

Spirit of Man, Awake!

It is always darkest just before the dawn. Brutal war, dreadful starvation, pitiful anguish and despair fill the earth with fear and sorrow. They may become worse—that is what we fear.

Will the present and impending catastrophe dim our intelligence, or sharpen our wits to escape the still more terrible suffering of humanity?

This valley of the shadow of death of man may be both an end and a beginning. An end to the clouds of ignorance and superstition which darkened the rays of the bright rising sun of science. The beginning of the dazzling white splendor of the new light of knowledge of the ways and means of controlling nature and society, which can make for all of us a grand new world of material abundance, physical health, social tranquility, and world peace.

Spirit of man, awake! Behold the scattering of the dark clouds of night, the dawn of a new day!

HERBERT STURGES.

World Religion

LELAND P. STEWART

The saying "necessity is the mother of invention" certainly has proved itself true in the present age. Man has overcome the problems of the physical universe with almost unbelievable rapidity and cleverness. But the real force of this saying is now being felt in the area of *human relations*. There, the pressure of necessity is overwhelming; the compulsion produced by increasing world strife is at last undeniable; and so a way must be found to deal with this tremendously important and complex problem on an international basis.

Of course, attempts already have been made to establish some kind of world government. These are both worthwhile and inevitable, because eventually such an organization must be established. However, just when will the world at large recognize that the real core of lasting peace is not to be found in satisfactory governmental organizations, but in a workable religion? In other words, governments are primarily restraining organizations and have little or nothing to do with directing people toward higher ethical living, whereas religions are supposed to provide the basis upon which individuals can build ethical lives and promote peace throughout society. At present, the eleven living religions are pre-scientific in their conceptions and ideals, thereby being highly ineffective for solving the problems of our industrial civilization. The only alternative is to construct and establish a religion which will take into account what we know about the nature of the world and its inhabitants, leaving room for additions of those items which we do not know.

Almost ten years ago a book was written which prophesied the direction this religion would take. Charles Morris of the University of Chicago, in his *Paths of Life: Preface to a World Religion,* has shown the inevitability of a union of at least the major living religions. He points out that some of them overemphasize detachment from the world, others stress attachment to the world, and the remainder put their emphasis upon the life of service. The research and insights which Morris has presented in this book and elsewhere show that he is playing the rôle of the modern John the Baptist by setting the stage for coming events. What he predicts is that a religion will arise which will combine the vital elements of existing religions into a new, correctly-balanced world religion. In fact, he has studied young people in various countries throughout the world and has discovered that the forces of the modern age are shaping them in accord with this pattern.

His work, and that of a considerable number of other thinkers, has outlined quite clearly the direction which must be taken in our struggles to establish lasting peace. The task which remains—the task that Western civilization has been afraid to undertake—is to apply our knowledge of the world to each of the living religions, making whatever additions, subtractions, and alterations are necessary, in creating a scriptural document sufficiently broad and accurate to be used as the basis of this religious development.

One of the items which our industrial civilization, with its mass-production methods, finds it difficult to include is the recognition of an educated level of citizens. Our religions have given evidence of this fact recently by producing less and less effect upon these people. Studies have been made, for example, showing that only about 20 per cent of people within this group accept the doctrines of Christianity. Many of them, consequently, have abandoned that religion and found nothing to replace it. Such a condition, without a doubt, has had a tremendously paralyzing effect upon any attempts toward human progress.

To consider the abandonment of Christianity, or any of the existing religions, would be foolish indeed. Within each religion are found many grains of the truth for which mankind continues to search. Established religions, with all their archaic theological concepts and paradoxes of institutionalization, are not by any means worthless. Our need is not to destroy but to build. Therefore, we must consider how it will be possible to construct from these traditions a religion which is intelligible and beneficial to modern man.

Arnold J. Toynbee has pointed out that the majority of the world's population always has been, and indeed probably always will be, non-creative. In fact, almost all kinds of activity, both human and non-human, show that only a small number of isolated cases deviate from the trend of the majority. In the human realm this fact merely shows that most people's lives are ruled at least 90 per cent by conventionality. Yet those who carry civilizations forward are, first and foremost, the members of the creative minority, who in turn generally represent a very small percentage of the educated group. While these few leaders set the pace, other people, both educated and uneducated, follow along with the crowd, not stopping long enough to think out a better course.

Our religious traditions have made the notion of conformity more evident than almost any other human activity. Albeit people's thoughts about life and the world have developed slowly throughout the ages, the established religious systems have such tremendous inertia that only a very outstanding religious prophet can make any sizable alteration in them, and such persons are all too rare. As a result, dogmatics have entered history time after time, until now the educated man generally finds himself completely out of harmony with the conventional theological patterns, at least as far as their affecting his life is concerned.

A world religion will not attempt to supplant the orthodox traditions. Those people who are satisfied to remain within these traditions need not be affected by world religion at all, any more than the establishment of world government will destroy city governments. Instead, world religion will be an outgrowth of the traditions, and will be based upon the findings of all fields of knowledge up to the latest possible date. It should be a dynamic religion, best suited to those who have thought beyond the limitations of their particular traditions. However, even if a person wished to remain officially within some religious tradition, he still could benefit greatly by studying the teachings put forward in the central scriptural document of world religion.

To understand fully what world religion will be, it is necessary to consider the way in which it is being constructed. Its main object is to discover similarities and differences in the teachings of all living religions that still are known to be valid in terms of modern knowledge and insights. These teachings must be

combined in such a way as to eliminate the doctrines of the individual religions and to express their ideas in a form applicable to all civilized cultures, not just one.

One of the most noticeable trends in this scientific age is the decline of the supernatural element in religion. Although untold numbers of people still cling to orthodox theological formulations for the sake of preserving tradition, few really are motivated by these concepts or understand the symbolism behind them. These ideas about the nature of God and man—having been conceived during a time when the earth was considered to be flat, as well as at the center of the universe—logically would tend to mean less as man learns more about the true nature of the world. People pay tribute to many ideas long after they have lost their meaning, as was shown amply in Roman history (several centuries B.C.), when Rome tried to adapt the old agricultural gods to the life of the city-state. Present society is slowly waking up to the fact that religion can be expressed in any number of ways, and that the supernatural way is not nearly as effective today as it was before the industrial revolution of about 150 years ago. In the future, this trend certainly will continue; hence, world religion must be expressed in non-supernatural terms, in order to maintain its true significance despite ever-changing world conditions.

The concept which Christians are reluctant to give up is the idea that the Father-God of the Christian Church is the only valid conception of the Eternal. A study of other religions shows that each one has a somewhat different idea about the term "God." Practically all religious traditions cling to some kind of personal god, but many of the truly religious individuals, such as the mystics, have found that the Infinite is enshrouded in mystery but need not have any human dimensions or descriptions, i. e., mind, intelligence, love, hate, jealousy, and concrete labels such as "He." Taoism perhaps provides the best example of a God concept as the ultimate in life, but gives it no human proportions or limitations. Since world religion must take into account all the different conceptions of God, it must use broad terms which can allow each person to conceive the Eternal as he finds meaningful in terms of his own thinking and experience.

As soon as one broadens his conception of God, he will find that the "kingdom of God" or the "kingdom of heaven" takes on quite different significance. Although many people, particularly in Western civilization, have interpreted this phrase to mean a social utopia here on earth at some time in the future, many statements made by Jesus Christ would indicate an entirely different symbolic meaning. Consider, for example, the beatitude, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Since the verb is in the present tense and the remark is addressed to certain individuals, the sentence implies an inner fullness obtainable only by those who live in the manner taught. No matter how much society is improved, it will never be perfect, though we should continually strive to make it so. The "kingdom of God," which is described so well in the New Testament gospels, "is within you" and might be expressed best as the condition of *lasting happiness,* which results from locating the way of life by which one can most effectively serve mankind. "He who loses his life shall find it" means that he who loses his life in working for the betterment of others has found what religion really is. Jesus' parable of the merchant who, having found one pearl of great worth, sold all that he had and bought it, illustrates in another way the same feeling of lasting happiness which the kingdom of God symbolizes. Because we know by studying various personalities throughout history that this phenomenon exists, world religion should describe it in its non-supernatural terms of lasting happiness or its equivalent.

The world today is being transformed by the use of the scientific method of investigation, which was not tried systematically in any previous period of history. This method starts with what is known, and proceeds to the unknown in search of truth. In the past, man has made assumptions whenever he met with phenomena he did not understand; now he is discovering that most of his assumptions were either partially or completely wrong. Hence, he is having to reconstruct his ideas on the basis of this much sounder method.

One of his assumptions has been that there is some kind of life after death, for which this earthly life is merely preparatory. Having made this presupposition, he has tried to build his philosophy of life accordingly, and his resulting difficulties often have been manifold. Now he is learning that this assumption need not be made; instead, a study of various personalities shows that man can build a perfectly consistent and worthwhile life in terms of what he finds here and now, if only he will set out to do so. Anything else which might or might not follow upon death need have no bearing upon what he should do now. Gordon W. Allport of Harvard has concluded from his research that mature individuals have in common: (1) a variety of autonomous interests, (2) personal insight and a sense of humor, and (3) a unifying philosophy of life; none of which has anything to do with their views concerning life after death. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Thus, in constructing a world religion, we must take for granted no resurrection stories or rebirths of souls, because these ideas have definite cultural limitations and have no essential bearing upon the development of mature personality. What we do know is that the person who lives for a worthy cause and gives his life to the betterment of others is not forgotten when he dies. His life blends into the total picture of evolution and progress which becomes the Eternal. What can man desire that is better than this?

Similarly, each conception of the living religions should be examined to see whether or not it can be accepted as is or reinterpreted in modern terms. From this examination a central scriptural document must be constructed which combines the valid teachings of all these religions and adds to them other appropriate scriptural writings, such as parts of *The Prophet,* by Kahlil Gibran. The more worthy descriptions of the Infinite which can be collected and screened by means of universal criteria, the more possible it will be to find a meeting of minds throughout all parts of the world. Only in this way can understanding of different peoples be given a sound and permanent basis.

The next phase of scientific evolution will be in the social fields, with the progress of man as its ultimate goal. To cope with human problems adequately, it is necessary to grapple with religion, because in this area lies the core of man's attempts to progress. The religious quest is what leads man to the great heights that he seeks in striving to perfect himself and the world in which he lives. A study of man that did not take into account his religious problems and needs would be empty indeed.

Because man never in the past has found a means by which he could progress humanly to any great degree, he has turned his energies in other directions, most recently toward the development of an industrial civilization. This advancement is, of course, a prerequisite to any great amount of human progress, because of its possible reduction of the struggle for existence, but it is not adequate by itself. Man is coming to realize now that he can no longer ignore human problems without destroying civilization completely. He thereby is being forced from all sides toward the consideration of mankind and its destiny. As a result of this trend, the area of man's greatest concern must be his religion. When his religion improves in effectiveness, he will have a basis for moving ahead; as it is now he meets mainly with attitudes of stagnation or indifference, because people have come to expect sameness and standardization in this area.

No matter how many people can comprehend the whole basis of world religion, all people can benefit from it. There is no field in which man has to make so many changes as in religion. Very few people, even in the ministry or priesthood itself, understand what religious experience really is, because of its great complexity and rare occurrence. It is so much easier to propagate the doctrines of a particular theological system that the majority of the clergy merely have avoided the real issues. Hence, it is time to construct a set of values and a pattern of living that will lead us in a forward direction by taking into account the age in which we live. In this endeavor all interested persons can both help and derive benefits.

Many people probably would argue that a religion must be "geared to the masses" in order to be of value. How then, they would ask, can a world religion of this sort be feasible?

Admittedly, this kind of religion is in many ways different from what we have had throughout most of history, although the Greeks had a system that might have been somewhat comparable. But we are living in a different kind of world now from that of the past; we are beginning to see man and his potentialities in a new light.

When we recognize that an educated minority does exist, we also should see that to offer the same aspects of religion to these people as to the uneducated majority is to force them to look elsewhere for their serious interests. Yet the creative part of this minority is in general the group most influential in causing progress. Thus we need to establish a basis of growth for these people, as well as for all others, if we ever hope to make the most of our present opportunities.

We must provide a kind of pyramid that will allow all people, the educated and the uneducated, to rise toward the desired peak of universalized thinking and creative religious living. As our religious tradition affects its adherents today, almost every attempt to bring about advancement is eventually pulled back into the same conventional pattern and eliminated. Progress under these conditions is next to impossible. To grow in character is to be raised above oneself to ever greater heights of achievement in terms of service to others. For this to be accomplished there should be a scriptural guide adequate for all civilized peoples, which thereby must be a doctrineless one. The object of world religion is not to win converts but to help people to grow spiritually.

The need for world peace is the compelling incentive for this kind of religion. The overly-materialistic West and the overly-detached East must find a meeting ground in this religion through a mysticism that both affirms life and the world, and leads men to ethical living. Only in this way can we overcome the loss of creativity which the industrial age has thus far brought about.

This is our hope and our dream!

Modern Man's Quest—An Ethic of Evolution

LEO HIRSCH

At the outset it is important to emphasize that, before modern man can pursue this new quest for a satisfying ethic, it is necessary for him to clearly realize that he must divest himself of certain superstitions, prejudices, and ignorances that he acquired during the long stretches of the pre-historic and pre-scientific period and that have left a serious blight on his mind, so that modern society finds these a serious handicap and impediment to further human progress.

Man must determinedly ignore the thought so deeply engraved on his intellect by centuries of orthodox Christian and Hebrew teaching that man was born into a state of perfection and that he has fallen from that elevation by his taste of sin. So that the traditional view expressed both in the Old and New Testaments is no longer tenable. This refers to the story of the creation of all the different animals, then man, and finally woman. Then man's fall from perfection due to his eating of the fruits of the Tree of Knowledge and finally how man was redeemed from eternal damnation through the sacrifice of Jesus. He must start with the scientifically accepted truth that he was born of many influences into a rather primitive state and that he has evolved, and continues to evolve, into ever higher forms of physical, mental, and spiritual existences. Putting it in the simplest terms, the theory of evolution simply means: specialized creatures of today have descended by gradual change from different and usually simpler creatures of the past. The fact that we do not know *how or why* simpler creatures of the past evolved into the more complex does not alter the situation.

If moral truths are to be discovered by rational inquiry, if moral truth is not revealed once and for all by some supernatural authority, it must like all human wisdom be subject to continued correction. "New occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth." To question what has long passed as moral truth is a vital duty, if we are to be saved from the blind moral fanaticism which has been one of the worst oppressions of mankind. To mention only one example, the heroic struggle to cure mankind of the obsession which prevailed from the time of King Saul to nearly the end of the Seventeenth Century, viz.: the belief in witchcraft and in the duty to kill the witches.

Science has revealed that evolution has produced in man an astounding and unique organism guided both by reason and conscience. Man's growing intellect has grasped the facts revealed by science that we live in a cosmos and not in a chaos, that the universe in which

we live rests on law and order, reason, and purpose. We need but follow science's investigation and discoveries, we need but extend the curve of progress from ape-like progenitors to man an equal interval of time into the future to see the most dazzling possibilities. And these would still be but a beginning! Life itself has existed on this planet about one thousand million years. At the utmost, only a very small part of this evolutionary development has seen man rise above the animal level. The possibilities are that, with self-control and full intellectual freedom, he may advance and progress a thousand times as far again. Even as his mental plane is new and embryonic, so his descendants may achieve some intellectual horizon on a plane as far beyond comprehension as was the growth from the primates to homo sapiens. This higher plane does not as yet exist. We must build it step by step and the heights which we may thus achieve will be proportional to the wisdom and foresight with which we build. The blueprints have been designed by an intellectual minority. Time alone will tell whether this spearhead plus the democratic processes of educational and economic equality will so influence the mass of mankind that they will coöperate to assist in this gigantic task.

Man must reject the idea inculcated by orthodox religious doctrine that man possesses an evil nature and that he lacks the power and ability to transcend that evil, and must, therefore, rely solely on the direct intervention of a supernatural power to save him and his civilization. He must accept the fact taught by centuries of human experience that man is fundamentally good and not evil. That man is a moral animal and that all men, with few exceptions, feel some degree of compulsion to value and promote the good, to condemn and eliminate the bad. It requires no demonstration that a demand for ethical standards is deeply ingrained in human psychology. Man's profound power of self-judgment makes it possible for man to do what no other part of creation can do—know that he *sins and errs*. For within man is this spiritual power that, through his moral experiences and moral journey in life, he may come to comprehend some of the purposes of his life and his conduct. The existence of this inner life and judgment of the conception of values by which our lives ought to be lived, even against continued failure, demands intellectually the presence of a transcendent judgment, i. e., the recognition of a new sense, a spiritual sense. Hence, we must recognize this reality: that man possesses, by his moral experiences, a conscience, a capacity for clear, moral judgment.

Modern man must start this quest with the realization that there is no individual on this planet as yet who is so intellectually and spiritually developed that he can envision and understand the Universal Whole in all its ramifications and that perhaps these powers may never be attained by him. The utmost that is granted to any of us, even the most gifted, is to grasp a segment of truth here and a segment of truth there. Then we perhaps do the human thing by assuming that the small segment of truth we have grasped incorporates and embodies the Universal Whole, which it does not. From this comes the resulting inference to beware of any infallibility of judgment on the part of any individual or group of individuals in regard to any problems in the religious, political, or economic fields. This compels us to reject any ideologies that rest on finality, dogmas, and absolutes. The door of the mind must be left open for the entrance of a constantly growing evolutionary ethic. The search for an absolute ethic, either intuitive or naturalistic, has been a failure. For man has risen, not fallen.

Man must grasp the fact that the essential feature arising from the unique status of man in the history of life is seen to be his possession of personal responsibility. It may now be realized that the highest and most essential moral ethical standards are involved in the fact of man's personal responsibility. If there are to be no further wars, it is man, and not some interference on the part of a supernatural power, that will prevent their occurrence. This responsibility is a fact, a fundamental and peculiar characteristic of the human species established by his evolution and evident in his relationship to the rest of the cosmos. Recognition of this responsibility and its proper exercise are the firm basis on which right and moral human action must be based.

Human responsibility requires in each individual, as well as in society as a whole, that the search for knowledge be a search for truth, as unbiased as is possible for human beings; that probable truths, as discovered, be tested by every means that can be devised. The right method is evaluation of evidence and avoidance of intuition and of authoritarian dogma. It is the rejection of revelation or of emotional reaction when knowledge is available. It further rejects the absolute nature of any authority. From these premises arises the ethical judgment that it is good, right, and moral to recognize the integrity and dignity of the individual and to promote the realization or fulfillment of individual capacities; and that it is bad, wrong, and immoral to fail in such recognition or to impede such fulfillment. This ethic applies first of all to the individual himself and to the integration and development of his own personality. It must extend farther to his social group and to all mankind. Negatively, it is wrong to develop one individual at the expense of another. Individuals vary greatly in other capacities, but integrity and dignity are capable of equal development in all.

Socialization and individualization must be ever jointly pursued, as one cannot exist without the other. They may seem to conflict but they may also work together for the advancement of each. Here again choice is possible and not only a possibility but also an unavoidable necessity and responsibility. Individual integration and welfare can be secured at the expense of others, which is using unethical means, but they may also be achieved and reach their highest development by interaction which promotes others with self.

It is important to note that overemphasis on personal salvation in Russian, Indian, and Christian religions was the cause for the failure on the social side of religion. Religion becomes mutilated and stunted because it does not meet the deep social needs of man. Amid the disease, usury, landlordism, and extreme poverty which weigh down the people in India, Asia, and Africa, religious traditionalists justify their opposition to any relief in the name of religion. The solution of personal problems is only a prelude to reaching out into society. Personal ethics is only the basis and preparation to social ethics. Failing to grasp this truth, we become religious egotists. The alternative to such failure to envision the larger social unity is our present decadence and corruption in our political and economic life and leadership and the consequent cynicism and despair.

Under this system of ethical standards, a definition of the good society might indeed be simply that it is a society in which each individual uses ethical means to attain the ethical goal. An individual in society leads no existence wholly apart from that society, any more than the most solitary individual of any species of organisms can exist without reference to its environment. The social group is part of the human environment, largely a self-created, self-controlled part. It is the medium in which the individual exists and it is one of the molding evolutionary influences on the individual.

Hence, the collective aspect of the state is, or ethically should be, achieved by means of personal responsibility in all its members. Collective social measures, including provisions for the underprivileged, are, or ethically should be, undertaken to prevent unethical development of some individuals at the expense of others and to promote the ethical equal development of all to the extent of their capacities. Equality of education and of economic opportunity must be the basis of the good society. Such collective action to promote individual development and prevent exploitation is required in an ethically good society. So that in the final analysis personal responsibility cannot be delegated.

The broadest problem now facing mankind is choice and decision between conflicting ideologies. Evolutionary ethics demand unequivocal decisions. They demand the rejection of both authoritarianism and totalitarianism, whether sponsored by a church, a state, or an economic system. Authoritarianism is wrong and unscientific. The rigid assignment of absolute authority on a fixed basis, without constant check and periodic review, inevitably involves an attempt to delegate responsibility that cannot be delegated and to evade responsibility for subsequent actions of the delegate. This is an ethically wrong denial of the personal responsibility inherent in man's nature. Such a system inevitably leads to exploitation of all by the authoritarian dictator and the development of a hierarchy in which each higher group exploits those below it. This means a morally wrong development of some few individuals, not along with but at the expense of others, denying by these acts the basic integrity and worthiness in all human beings.

A concrete example of this is orthodox Christendom, as composed today, which still flaunts its authoritarianism. Despite all of its half-hearted declarations, it still assumes an air of superiority over such a minority religion as Judaism and looks upon it as an object of conversion to its own theologies. It still fails to give recognition to the many contributions of Judaism to ethics, philosophy, and religion. Its Fundamentalists in the southern states still look upon our colored fellow beings as inferiors and cling to their prejudice of white supremacy. The inference to be drawn is that there is no such thing as absolute authority and infallible judgment residing in any individual or group of individuals.

Totalitarianism is wrong. The abstract concept of a state as a separate distinct entity, with its own rights and responsibilities, contravenes the biological and social fact that all rights and responsibilities are vested by nature in the individuals that compose the state. The absurd claim that the welfare of the state is superior to that of any or all of its component individuals is thus ridiculous on the face of it and the claim inevitably is used to excuse denial of maximum opportunities for individual development by all, a denial which is inhuman and immoral.

Concomitants sure to occur in such a state are regimentation of all individuals, policing of all conduct (including conduct ethically good), judgment of knowledge and of ideas on a basis other than that of their truth and falsity, and consequent suppression of all truth, and the unethical control of the dissemination of knowledge, the ineradicable existence of personal responsibility and the value of individual integrity and dignity. The Soviet Union is a perfect example of the totalitarian state. So long as Soviet Russia and its communist thought and practice adhere rigidly to the Marxist outlook on life, it will be difficult, yes, impossible, to think of the possibility of getting along peacefully with the present Russian government. Unless in some way we can influence Soviet Russia to a modification of communist doctrine and practice, with its absolutes and unethical means, peace will be out of our reach.

Democracy has its weaknesses, imperfections, and contradictions in many of its current phases, but democracy is the only political and economic ideology which can be made to embrace an ethically good society by the standards here outlined. *Laissez faire* capitalism that permits and promotes selfish or unfair utilization of some individuals by others is obviously wrong by ethical standards. Capitalism as it is today is perfectly consistent with authoritarianism or totalitarianism and is of course evil if involved, as it is, in either of these morally wrong systems. This will prevail until constitutionalism is established in our economic life. In a socialized democracy, it is imperative that capitalism should be regulated and democratized, so that each group in industry will be functionally represented and have a voice in management.

We of the West must put our house in order, politically, economically, intellectually, and spiritually. Some of the highest values emphasized in our democratic declaration must not be denied in their observance but must be constantly practiced. Our lack of observance and application is one of the main reasons why Communism has made such rapid strides. We face no easy task in trying to introduce adequate standards of social morality into an economic system that is firmly established and that has grown up for nearly 170 years on the theory of rugged individualism. Our traditional code of economic virtues needs transformation and a new balance between self-interest and community responsibility. It has ignored man's needs as a social animal and must make a place for them. We have never yet achieved the building of an ethical society on the common basis of freedom and progressive social morality. That unprecedented task now confronts us. Our overemphasis on personal ethics has placed an immovable impediment in the path of social progress.

A personal salvation cannot be achieved without a general salvation. As modern psychotherapy tends increasingly to diagnose this problem, this theory is constantly reinforced. There is no use in healing a personal neurosis if you can only return the disturbed individual to the social environment through which he became mentally sick. For each one of us is only a complete, coördinated consciousness when we embrace and include, are embraced and included by, the whole. Individual, personal ethics, of which each one of us must be his own judge, has little to do with social ethics, for social conduct depends upon what

source of procedures do actually best promote social well-being, or "the good of the whole." That is a question that can only be determined by science and religion. For it is only a combination and integration of science and religion that can guide us to rational social living. A mature knowledge and social conscience can only result from a fuller development of science and religion. How few individuals are fully aware of the social implications of their personal conduct!

In this connection, Bertrand Russell said:

> It is only a few rare and exceptional men who have that kind of love toward mankind at large that makes them unable to endure patiently the general mass of evil and suffering regardless of what relation it may have to their own lives. These few, driven by sympathetic pain, will seek first in thought and then in action for some way of escape, some new system of society by which life may become richer, more full of joy and less full of preventable evils than it is at present. . . . A life lived in the spirit, the spirit that aims at creating rather than possessing, has a certain fundamental happiness of which it cannot be wholly robbed by adverse circumstances. This is the way of life recommended by all the great teachers of the world.

Before we can make further progress in the pursuit of a progressive social ethic, we must put an end to racial segregation and injustices by accepting the factual results of modern science that these have their roots in ignorance and prejudice. We must do more than enunciate the same old platitudes about justice and brotherhood, we must find definite and concrete means for translating the modern ideas of ethics into the realities of community life. When we created democracy and the democratic ideal, we rejected the obsolete notion of racial superiority and accepted the postulate that man was of infinite worth and that democracy means the end of discrimination and acquiescence of inequality.

Class and race and nation are concepts too narrow and too small to unite mankind. We must have a larger concept, one of world family in which all men are brothers. So, what the world needs today are ethical engineers who comprehend the sources of human strength and weakness and will work to reconstruct society along democratic lines. Unless we can meet these requirements, it will be impossible to make further progress along spiritual lines. In fact, it may mean the end of moral civilization as we know it. Man needs the tremendous revelations which science will continue to bring, but as he is a creature of the spirit he also needs an ethical faith commensurate with his intellectual growth. Science and religion must complement one another. Each of these two major activities represents the two outstanding qualities inherent in man—reason and conscience. Science is the sharp instrument of reason that develops a knowledge of the facts and the laws of nature and human nature, and religion is the instrument that develops conscience and the values and aspirations of man's innermost life. Both of these instruments are necessary for the life and the further progress of the race.

Modern man has gained the power to destroy himself. Unless we can develop a vast deal more of good will in the world, of genuine unselfishness and love, of sympathetic compassion to soften and harmonize our relations with our fellowmen, the task of building a peaceful and happy social order seems hopeless.

Man's remarkable progress in communication and transportation has welded this world into a closely knit unit, so that physically we are One World. In order to meet this situation, we must devise a spiritual education that will bring about that transformation in man that will enable him to pass from egocentricity to sociocentricity. He must be taught to be willing and eager to perform his unique function as an independent cell and also be conscious of his duty to coöperate with all the other cells in that larger organism: humanity.

How can we prepare the way for a social order better and saner and juster than that which now exists? Is it possible, in a shifting, changing society, which is in process of moral transformation, for those who are leaders and possess advantages which in an ethical society would not belong to them, to have the firmness and the desire to relinquish those advantages and thus promote the welfare of all? If we accept the requirements outlined here, what are the next steps that we must take to promote the further spiritual development of man? There must evidently be some plan or else our efforts are foredoomed to be feeble and confused and lead us nowhere. Some distinct end must be set up toward which to direct our efforts. The test of the right end is that it shall be of such a nature as to urge and stimulate us to new effort. Toward what point of the social compass shall it be directed? What scheme of social reconstruction shall we adopt?

May I offer a few suggestions based on my personal convictions after a lifetime of experience and study?

Our primary concern should be adequately to define and interpret the word "human." Most persons will probably agree that the immediate task of social reform is to recognize and bring forward the "human factor" in our economic life, to secure due respect and consideration for all human beings in their *human quality*. How can we determine what this human quality is? For our purpose, let us use the rough classification: things, animals, human beings. We know that man is not just a thing composed of matter or derived from force. True, his body is subject to the law of gravitation and other physical laws. Man is also subject to all the laws of chemistry and physics; he is subject to all the laws of vegetative life; he is subject to all the laws of sentient life, including the emotions which he shares with the other animals. But also, in addition to that, we see man performing actions which are not limited by space, nor by length, breadth, and thickness, and surely not measurable in terms of material things. The thing he shares with inanimate objects however is not the characteristically human nature in him. So, man should not be treated as a thing. Therefore, labor is not a commodity to be bought and sold like merchandise. If we desire to develop the human element in man, we must beware how we look upon him. The keynote of all social reform is to bring about the right way of looking upon our fellowmen.

In the next place, man is not merely an animal with instinctual desires to satisfy. It is true he has a physical organism like animals, sensitive to pain and pleasure, to hunger and thirst. But again we must recognize that his animal nature is not the characteristically human quality in him. We must, therefore, beware how we express our respect for men in terms of the satisfaction of their merely animal wants. What I am eager to press home is that, in escaping from the thing view of human beings, we are in danger of looking on them as animals. If we look on men as animals, the idea of justice is not applicable. Animals are not man's moral equals and justice is founded on moral equality.

The question—What is the distinctively human nature in man?—demands a clear, explicit answer. Many answers have been given and tried in the past. For example: Christian theology called this quality soul. Aristotle called it reason, the higher faculties—the faculty for language and the ability to form abstract ideas. All the answers thus far projected have failed because the majority were excluded from the conception of the human. To avoid all the revolting doctrines of the elect, we must anchor the title of every man to be considered fellowman not on any special quality realized in some few members of the race, but in some quality that exists potentially in all. To ascertain the principle of our common humanity, it is important to discover the common quality which attaches to every member of the human race. My own conviction is that the common quality is the *potentially best* that exists in every human being and I would define it by the sense of *organic relationship* with others, the realization of the individual that in his innermost self he is socially determined, and a clear understanding that to live means basically to live in and through and with others without surrender of self. This in substance means to influence others so as to bring to birth new life conjointly in them and in one's self. An awareness that others stand in organic, i.e., spiritual, relations with us. The creative response to this must be the joint responsibility for the attainment in each of the ultimate aim and purpose of life.

The democratic ideal postulates that there is something precious in every human being and that our duty is to bring it to light. That this unexpressed preciousness exists in human beings is the foundation of ethics, religion, and democracy. Hence the democratic way of life means a way of living so as to release and promote the spiritual life in others. This dynamic way of democratic living in others without surrendering self is exemplified by mothers in the slums who work ceaselessly to give their children a better chance in life; by striking workmen who face starvation rather than submit to injustice. With this democratic postulate in mind, what ethic shall we try to evolve in order to be saved?

This brings us to the next suggestion: Let us beware how we look on man, how we think of him, for, as we look on him and think of him, so will we treat him. If we regard him as a thing, we will use him and exploit him when the opportunity arises. If we regard him as an animal, we will feel no compunction in destroying him, just as we do animals.

To make further human progress, we must recognize that man is a spiritual human being and if we would help him we must contact him at the point of his spiritual nature which is the fundamental truth of his characteristically human nature.

We must recognize that the distinctively human quality is not to be found in the higher qualities in respect to which there is the greatest diversity but in the *highest quality of all;* not in that which has been actualized in anyone but in that which is *potential.* The claim that all men are created morally equal, the foundation on which democracy rests and is to be built up, is to be founded in the spiritual possibilities that exist in all, however unexpressed they are at present.

We must so educate our children as to make them aware that man is not in business or in the professions primarily to make a wage, salary, or profit but that the real purpose should be the development of the mind and character of the man who engages in these activities. At present our economy is so motivated that the industrial product and the potential profit incorporated in it is the end, and the workers are the means to that end. The ethical relation should be the exact reverse. Man's character development should be the end, and the product and the profit the mere incident—the by-product. The man, as he is influenced and shaped inwardly in the course of his work, is to be regarded as the true product.

We must establish constitutional government of industry as a bridge between the despotic government of Communism and the paternalistic government of capitalism now in use in two opposing governments. The creation of organic democracy is the important next step. We must find working compromises between free enterprise and democratic socialism, and between justice expressed in terms of material benefits and justice presented as the sum total of the thoughts, acts, and work which in their totality facilitate the freeing of life. The problem of ethics is to find the ways to the good life in our individual relationships as well as in our relationships to society.

In the political field, it is important to create a system of world government, a federation of the commonwealths of nations to meet the needs of a unified one world. By this instrument we will be able to meet the problems that have beset and worsted other civilizations and that have come to a head in our world today. World-wide security can be found only in a world-wide organization. That organization is at present represented by the United Nations but must be implemented by a World Federal Government in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. Such an organization may eliminate war from future generations. Such a union must include Russia, as well as her satellites, the United States, and all others. A union that will have to meet the security needs of all the nations, and the only way that can be done is if all the nations will agree to modify their ideas of sovereignty. All these things can be achieved if we transform the United Nations by amendment under Article 109. The United States through its State Department should declare to the world that this World Federal Government is the ultimate pur-

---

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page 2*)

Yugoslav river-control personnel stationed on the Romanian side of the river, and replaced them with untrained Romanians, thereby making the river passage extremely hazardous. Romania has boycotted the Yugoslav members of the joint administration, and has even held over the head of the Yugoslavs the intention of establishing a new "Gate headquarters" in Romanian Orsowa, a move that would shut off Yugoslav participation completely.

Another Danube country unable to do much shipping on Central Europe's biggest river is Austria. A large Austrian Danube fleet exists, but few of its ships can traverse the river under the Austrian flag. Most are rusting away in the "winter port" near Vienna's Soviet sector, though a few luxurious Austrian Danube boats went upstream in 1945 and serve now as excursion vessels or floating hotels.

—*Worldover Press.*

pose and goal of her foreign policy and that she earnestly solicits the cooperation of Russia and all the nations to help find a satisfactory basis for such a union. A World Federal Union is the primary issue of our time, as peace can never be worked out without this amalgam.

Beyond all this, we must create a new ethical religion that will bind all people together rather than divide them. An ethical religion that will be free of dogmas, creeds, absolutes, and finalities; that will give us an unfailing faith in human nature—a faith that will dedicate us to something bigger and more important than ourselves and our possessions; that will teach us that there dwells in every man spiritual resources ever ready to inspire and lead him to finer, higher living, and that man can create a world where oppression would cease; where murder, under the guise of war, would be outlawed; and where a people's government could function with justice to all without corruption.

An ethical religion that conceives of man not as a mere creature or puppet of God, liable to constant interference on the part of the Creator, but possessing the same eternal power as the Creator's, with illimitable dimensions, subject like God himself to the laws of creation, having a will and a conscience and thus the right and the duty to exercise them, possessing all those requirements necessary for the realization of the vision seen from the moral and spiritual heights thus far attained by his innermost qualities. A religion that will fuse personal and social ethics so as to bring into being a better world. So that there will no longer be people who will say that it is no part of the duty of religion to make the world a better place and that religion is purely a personal matter. To perpetuate such belief is to cut the spinal cord of social endeavor, limit the range and application of an evolutionary ethic and support the abdication of religion from the whole field of politics and economics. Such beliefs are the very things that menace us today.

In conclusion, we need the firm heart, the clear mind, and the dauntless spirit. We need something of the iron faith of the Founding Fathers. They had the vision of man glorious and triumphant over the forces of evil and enslavement, forever on guard against tyranny and aggression—of man victorious, dignified by freedom, helpful and compassionate to the underprivileged and undeveloped. We must not betray this heritage.

Correspondence

A World Language

To UNITY:

The reply of Mr. Sherman D. Wakefield in UNITY to my letter, on the article of Kenneth L. Patton, makes me think that I may have misunderstood what he was trying to say. At any rate I hasten to say that this is the first time in forty years that any one has ever called me orthodox.

I am proud to belong to a church that has the name of Thomas Paine, the author of the Declaration of Independence, inscribed in golden letters in its hearth room, and which also has the name of Thomas Jefferson there, with that of Parker, Elliot, Channing, and others. I am proud to belong to a church whose Bond of Union adopted in 1879 says:

> We whose names are hereunto subscribed, desiring a religious organization in the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, which shall make integrity of life its first aim, and leave thought free, invite to membership all of whatever theological belief, who wish to unite with us to promote truth, righteousness, reverence and charity among men.

I write to welcome Mr. Wakefield to the Esperanto movement. He says, "I am a World Federalist and a believer in a world language, but I do not think that any artificial language is as satisfactory as a living language of international scope." I welcome him because that is exactly why we are Esperantists, except, of course, we do not agree that any language is a work of nature. All languages are works of art and therefore in the best sense are artificial. A national language cannot become a world language because it is not of "international scope."

We are Esperantists because we have a living language, in use by increasing thousands of people all over the world by living people, a work of great art, according to some of the world's greatest artists and thinkers, including Tolstoi, Upton Sinclair, and many others. I do not suppose that Mr. Wakefield used the word "scope" in the Latin or Greek sense of the word—a mark or aim, for if he had he would not afterwards propose a national language and a limited one at that for the international language.

Does Mr. Wakefield speak Basic English? If he can, he can do more than the author of it. I have it on good authority that one of the two authors of Basic English was asked to make a short talk in Basic before a meeting of teachers in England and admitted that he could not do so.

But suppose that one should make the great effort to learn Basic English so that he could talk with the foreigners who, of course, can learn to speak it, what use would he have for it? There are very few books in Basic and there are not likely to be very many. There are no magazines or newspapers in Basic, while there are many in Esperanto.

I wonder if Mr. Wakefield knows that Basic English is the property of the British government and can only be used with its permission? And that while the labor government was in power the language was put on ice? It may be that Churchill will again bring it out and try to sell it to the public. If he does, Lin Yutang can be expected to come up again with the question: "Why not Basic Chinese?"

It is several years since Mr. Churchill, when getting a Doctor's degree from Harvard, proposed Basic English. I am glad that the idea did not take even with English-speaking people, for if there is a good way to get ourselves hated in the world it will be to try to force our national language on the people of the world.

If Mr. Wakefield or any other reader of UNITY would like more information on the matter of Esperanto, a card or letter to me will bring it.

Yours for World Government and Esperanto NOW!

GLENN P. TURNER.

Middleton, Wisconsin.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

CENTENNIAL PROGRAM, CINCINNATI

Friday, May 2:

10:00 a. m.—Registration.
12:00 noon.—Luncheon and Business Meeting.
1:45-4:00 p. m.—Women's Alliance:
Mrs. Julius F. Krolfifer, Cincinnati, presiding.
Speaker: Miss Lois McColloch, Field Representative, the General Alliance of Unitarian Women.
Discussion Leader: Mrs. Frank Ansley, Vice President of the General Alliance for the Great Lakes Area.
1:45-4:00 p. m.—Unitarian Ministers Association, Western Conference Branch. Final session of the Institute.
4:30-5:30 p. m.—Visit to the new St. John's Unitarian Church.
6:00 p. m.—Dinner Meeting:
Rev. Julius F. Krolfifer, Cincinnati, presiding.
Speaker: Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, Conference Historian.
Subject: "Interesting Events Not Included in the History."
8:15 p. m.—Public Meeting:
Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Unitarian Conference, presiding.
Speaker: Rev. A. Powell Davies, D.D., Washington, D. C.
Subject: "Religion Must Make Sense."

Saturday, May 3:

10:00 a. m.—Platform Meeting:
Theme: "Frontiers of the Future."
Speakers: Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois.
Subject: "The Human Challenge of Liberal Religion."
Rev. Aron Gilmartin, Fort Wayne, Indiana.
Subject: "Authority and Free Religion."
12:00 noon.—Luncheon Meeting:
Rev. Ellsworth Smith, Cincinnati, presiding.
Speaker: Mr. William H. Hessler, Radio News Commentator, Cincinnati.
2:30 p. m.—Business Session:
Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President, presiding.
Report of the Treasurer: Mr. Herbert E. Clapham, LaGrange Park, Illinois.
Report of the Secretary: Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago.
Report of the Nominating Committee: Rev. John W. Cyrus, Omaha, Chairman.
Report of the By-Laws Commission: Mr. C. David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois, Chairman.
Report of the Credentials Committee.
Report of the Business Committee.
6:00 p. m.—Dinner Meeting:
Dr. Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit, Vice President of the Western Unitarian Conference, presiding.
Greetings from the new ministers in the area:
Hartley C. Ray, Chicago.
Zoltan Nagy, Alton.
John H. Morgan, Flint.
Alfred J. N. Henriksen, Iowa City.
Russell L. Lincoln, Detroit.
Erwin A. Gaede, South Bend.
John B. Isom, Louisville.
8:15 p. m.—Public Meeting:
Dr. Curtis W. Reese, presiding.
Speaker: Rev. Frederick May Eliot, D.D., LL.D., Boston, President of the American Unitarian Association.
Subject: "The Unitarian Gospel during the Next Fifty Years."

Sunday, May 4:

10:45 a. m.—Conference Service:
To be held at The First Unitarian Church, Reading Road and Linton Street.
Rev. Ellsworth Smith and Rev. Julius F. Krolfifer conducting the service.
Conference Preacher: Rev. Curtis W. Reese, D.D., Chicago. Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre and President of the Western Unitarian Conference.
Sermon: "Basic Convictions of Western Unitarianism."
1:30 p. m.—Conference Banquet:
Mr. Harry Burns, Cincinnati, Toastmaster.
Guests—The Executive Secretaries of the Conference:
Rev. Ernest C. Smith, 1909-1919.
Rev. Curtis W. Reese, 1919-1930, 1941-1943.
Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, 1930-1935.
Rev. Lon Ray Call, 1935-1941.
Rev. Randall S. Hilton, 1943-
Speaker: Prof. Dexter Perkins, Ph.D., Rochester, N. Y. Chairman, Department of History, University of Rochester; Moderator-Elect of the American Unitarian Association.

MINISTERS' INSTITUTE

Western Conference Branch, the Unitarian Ministers Association.
Rev. Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington, Illinois, President.
Rev. Max D. Gaebler, Davenport, Iowa, Secretary.

Wednesday, April 30:

4:00 p. m.—Registration.
6:00 p. m.—Dinner Meeting:
Speaker: Rev. Arthur W. Olsen, Toledo.
Subject: "Europe—Summer, 1951."
8:00 p. m.—Addresses:
Rev. Charles H. Lyttle, Professor Emeritus, Meadville Theological School, Chicago.
Subject: "Shifts in Emphasis in Unitarian Thought, 1852-1952."
Rev. James Luther Adams, Professor, Meadville Theological School, Chicago.
Subject: "Emerging Emphasis in Unitarian Thought."

Thursday, May 1:

9:00 a. m.—Devotional Service:
Rev. Edwin C. Palmer, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
9:30 a. m.—Discussion Panel:
Subject: "Enlisting, Training, Improving, and Protecting the Ministry."

Moderator: Rev. Kenneth C. Walker.
Panel Members:
Rev. Wallace W. Robbins, President, Meadville Theological School.
Mr. Allan Dampman, President, Student Body, Meadville Theological School.
Rev. Raymond B. Johnson, Director, Department of the Ministry, American Unitarian Association.
Rev. Robert Raible, President, Unitarian Ministers Association.
Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Secretary, Western Unitarian Conference.
12:00 noon—Luncheon.
1:00 p. m.—Preparation of group findings on the ministry.
2:00 p. m.—Reports on group findings; general discussion.
6:00 p. m.—Dinner Meeting:
Speaker: Dr. Van Meter Ames, Professor of Philosophy, University of Cincinnati.
8:00 p. m.—Panel Discussion:
Subject: "Enlisting, Informing, and Guiding Volunteer Workers."
Moderator: Rev. Robert T. Weston.
Panel Members:
Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, First Church, Chicago.
Rev. Arnold Westwood, Urbana, Illinois.
Rev. John W. Brigham, Sioux City, Iowa.
Rev. John W. Cyrus, Omaha, Nebraska.
Rev. Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis, Missouri.
9:00 p. m.—Discussion Groups.
9:30 p. m.—Reports of Discussion Groups.

Friday, May 2:
9:00 a. m.—Discussion Groups; final preparation of findings.
9:30 a. m.—Business Meeting: Election of officers.
10:30 a. m.—Critique on the Conduct of the Institute.
Critics: Rev. William D. Hammond, Grosse Pointe, Michigan.
Rev. Edward H. Redman, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
12:00 noon—Luncheon with Western Conference.
1:45 p. m.—Final Session and Summary of the Institute Program.

All meetings and sessions of both the Western Unitarian Conference and the Ministers' Institute, unless otherwise noted, will be held at the Hotel Alms, Victory Parkway and McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Reservations for hospitality, either in homes or at the hotel, should be sent to:
For the Conference—Mrs. Oscar Quimby, 3129 Penrose Place, Cincinnati 11, Ohio.
For the Institute—Rev. Julius Krolfifer, 449 Fairview Place, Cincinnati 19, Ohio.

SECRETARY'S SCHEDULE, 1951-52

May 4: Rockford, Illinois.
May 5: Alton, Illinois.
May 6: Bloomington, Illinois.
May 15: Chicago-Beverly.
May 27: Chicago-Beverly.
June 5: Conference Executive Committee.
June 8: Advisory Fellowship Committee.
June 12: Meadville Commencement.
June 13: Ordination, Eugene Leaming.
June 17: Chicago-Midwest Council Religious Liberals.
June 24-July 1: Geneva Conference.
July 5-6: Dayton, Ohio.
July 29: Free Religious Fellowship.
Aug. 4-5: Dayton, Ohio.
Aug. 29: Beverly-People's Liberal merger.
Sept. 16: Dayton, Ohio.
Sept. 17: Cincinnati, Ohio.
Sept. 22-23: Geneva Planning Council.
Sept. 24: Conference Board Meeting.
Sept. 25: Conference Planning Committee.
Oct. 7: Alton, Illinois.
Oct. 11-19: Montreal, General Conference.
Oct. 21: Oak Park Universalist Church.
Oct. 26-28: Omaha, Iowa Association.
Nov. 2-3: Ann Arbor, Michigan Conference.
Nov. 14-17: Minneapolis Dedication, Minnesota Conference.
Nov. 25: Beverly Fellowship.
Nov. 27: Lake Geneva, Wisconsin.
Dec. 2: Dayton and Springfield, Ohio.
Dec. 5: George Williams College.
Dec. 9: Madison, Wisconsin.
Dec. 10: Advisory Fellowship Committee.
Dec. 12: Springfield, Illinois.
Dec. 23: Shelbyville, Illinois.
Jan. 6: Indianapolis, All Souls.
Jan. 11-12: Louisville, Ohio Valley Conference.
Jan. 14: Conference Finance Committee.
Jan. 16: Geneva Publicity Committee.
Jan. 19-20: Detroit, Michigan.
Jan. 21: Conference Board Meeting.
Jan. 22: Conference Planning Committee.
Jan. 23: Rockford, Illinois.
Jan. 24: Geneva Publicity Committee.
Feb. 3: Kansas City, Missouri.
Feb. 10-13: Boston, A.U.A. Board and Committees.
Feb. 19-20: Des Moines, Iowa.
Feb. 22: South Bend, Charter Night.
Feb. 29: Cincinnati, Ohio.
March 9: Park Forest, Illinois.
March 10: Iowa City.
March 15-16: Toledo, Ohio.
March 19: Conference Finance Committee.
March 27: Dayton, Ohio.
March 30-31: South Bend, Indiana.
April 4-5: Bloomington, Illinois.
April 6: Springfield, Illinois.
April 13: Lincoln, Nebraska.
April 20: Davenport, Iowa.
April 27: Fort Wayne, Indiana.
April 30: Cincinnati, Ohio.

NOTES

Preston Bradley celebrated his fortieth anniversary as minister of the People's Church, Chicago, March 30, 1952. Dr. Frederick M. Eliot preached. . . . The First Unitarian Church of South Bend, Indiana, is the newest Unitarian church. Erwin Gaede was installed as minister March 31. . . . Bismark, North Dakota, is the newest Fellowship in the Conference. . . . Philip Schug has left Lincoln, Nebraska, and is now the minister at San Antonio, Texas. . . . Lester Mondale has resigned at Kansas City. . . .

FREEDOM MOVES WEST

The manuscript for the history of the Western Unitarian Conference is now completed. The Beacon Press is doing everything possible to have the book off the press for the Centennial Meetings. However, this may not be possible. To be sure that you get your copy as early as possible, order it now from the Western Conference Office.